

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/899,410	07/23/1997	DEANE E. GALLOWAY	•	7052
75	90 01/07/2002			
MARGATET M. DUNCAN			EXAMINER	
227 WEST MO	, WILL & EMERY NROE STREET		DYE, RENA	
CHICAGO, IL	60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	<u>ato</u>
			DATE MAILED: 01/07/2002	į U

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7 <b>9</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	08/899,410	GALLOWAY ET AL.
Autiony Motion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rena L. Dye	1772
The MAILING DATE f this communication	on appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED  Therefore, further action by the applicant is require final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eit condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	ed to avoid abandonment of thither: (1) a timely filed amendment Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	ent which places the application in
PERIOD F	OR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the	he mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	y expire later than SIX MONTHS from PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONT (a). The date on which the petition un e period of extension and the correspond date of the shortened statutory period the Office later than three months after	THS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP der 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension nding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension to for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 14 December 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (		
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be ent</li></ol>	ered because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require	e further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see	Note below);	
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the applic issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	cation in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without NOTE:	canceling a corresponding num	nber of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	would be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requapplication in condition for allowance becau		en considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consider raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		OLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amer explanation of how the new or amended cla		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as for	ollows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
3.☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure St	tatement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
10. Other:		
	(	Rena L. Dye Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1772





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments set forth in the 12/14/01 response have been carefully considered. It is the Examiner's position that Applicant's claims would include additional layers. Therefore, the Newsome reference continues to meet the claimed film structure. Although the Newsome reference teaches "films having 100% LLDPE in either layer 16 or 18 are not preferred because of difficulties in manufacturing them" the Examiner would like to direct Applicant's attention to claim 1 which does not recite a 100% LLDPE layer, and would therefore include blends.